THE VINDICATION OF A. Creſſener,

School-Maſter in LONG-ACRE,

From the Aſperſions of

A. PULTON,

Jeſuit and School-Maſter in the SAVOY;

Together

With ſome Account of His Diſcourſe with Mr. MEREDITH.

Imprimatur,

Octob. 24. 1687.

Hic Liber cui Titulus [The Vindication of *A. Creſſener*, &c.]

H. Maurice Reverendiſſimo in Chriſto P. D. Wilhelmo *Archiep.* Cant. *à Sacris.*

LONDON,
Printed for Ric. Chiſwell at the *Roſe* and *Crown* in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard. MDCLXXXVII.

THE VINDICATION OF *A. CRESSENER*, School-Master in LONG-ACRE.

"HERE a pleaſant School-Maſter di- Mr. *Fulton's* Aſperſions in his Narrative.
"verted the Auditory, with a Pi-
"cture (as he pretended) of the
"Bleſſed Trinity, which he ſhew-
"ed me, with wry Mouths, and many antick
"Geſtures; upon this I told him of God's ap-
"pearing in the ſhape of an Old Man, and
"that we might Picture him, ſo we meant
"not to delineate him *ſub ſpecie propriâ*.
"I turn'd to the Doctor, and preſs'd my fore-
"mention'd Argument, but the School-Maſter
"continuing to give Diverſion to the Compa-
"ny, and throw in Impertinent Queſtions, I bid
"him be ſilent, ſaying, I came not to Diſpute

" with a Buffoon, but a Doctor. Thus far our Diſputant, to which I Anſwer;

A Vindication of *A. C.*

That our Jeſuit cannot be Ignorant of the Method *A. C.* us'd in his Diſcourſe with him, without putting violence upon his Underſtanding, and wilfully reſolving to Miſ-repreſent his Adverſarie's Arguments whatever it coſt him. He tells us *A. C.* was pleaſant, and indeed ſo he was, and he that could keep his Temper amidſt a company of ſuch ſingular Arguments, as M. *P.* vented in defence of his Cauſe, he that could be ſo grave, as to deny himſelf the liberty of a Smile, at the ſingularity of M. *P*'s Reaſonings, hath really a greater ſhare of Mortification, than ever *A. C.* could pretend to. But our Jeſuit may Object, What had *A. C.* to do, to ſpeak in a Cauſe he had nothing to do with, was not the Doctor able to defend his Religion, without borrowing the Aſſiſtance of a By-ſtander, who yet appear'd impertinent enough in what he ſaid? As for the Impertinency of it, that ſhall come in in its place; 'twill I hope be ſufficient to rectifie Miſapprehenſions of this Matter, and to juſtifie the procedure of *A. C.* if the Reader be acquainted with the Motives that influenc'd him to ſpeak his Thoughts of what was ſaid by our Diſputant. The occaſion then was this.

The occaſion of *A. C*'s ſpeaking to Mr. *Pulton.*

The Reverend *D. T.* being ſometimes engaged with *M. M.* who ſate at his Left Hand, and who would ſeveral times interpoſe with private Queſtions of his own, though *D. T.* was never ſo cloſely engag'd with our Diſputant; 'twas the little Equity that appear'd in this ſort of conduct that urg'd *A. C.* to deliver his Sentiments of the Subject diſputed of, but ſtill with reſpect to the very foul play us'd by our Adverſaries. But what ſays our Jeſuit to all this? why truly juſt nothing, but

but on the contrary would insinuate to the World, that all that *A. C.* did in relation to the Conference, was abrupt and without necessity: I must confess if our Jesuit's bare saying all this was true, was sufficient to prove it so; it were an unpardonable Presumption in any Man to go about to perswade the World into a contrary Opinion; but because it is hop'd that *A. C.* may find better luck, than to be so unmercifully used, he comes now to give the World a true representation of his own Deportment at the Conference.

The true representation of the Words and Actions which Mr. *P.* hath so much misrepresented; together with their Defence.

And First, *A. C.* cannot forbear wondring, at our Jesuit's forwardness to Insinuate to the World, as though *A. C.* produc'd a resemblance of the Blessed Trinity (which is delineated in their own *Breviary*, set out by the Authorities of *Pius* the *5th.* and *Clement* *8th.*) abruptly and without any regard to the particular Subject disputed of; which if it had been so (as it was not) it were but equitable and fair to follow our Authors Example, who first pull'd out of his Pocket a *Breviary* to help his Memory, which would certainly have been at a loss without it. Is then our Author become so Criminal, that it is dangerous for any Man to follow his Example, without being reproach'd for it? for otherwise, how comes the same Action to be both prudent and safe in our Disputant, and yet ridiculous and dangerous in another, when the external Circumstances that produc'd that Action were both the same. M. *P.* pull'd his *Breviary* out of his Pocket to assist his own Memory, and his Adversary produces another *Breviary* to relieve his; this is really the Case: yet 'tis this Action our Jesuit takes so much pains to discredit; if there be any thing indecent in the Action, our Disputant ought to have given a better Example. Our Jesuit hath here a great mind to be thought in the right, and therefore says, that what

A. C.

A. C. had ſhown him, he pretended to be the reſemblance of the Bleſſed Trinity. But what does our Diſputant mean by pretended? not ſure that he himſelf had no other way of knowing it to be ſo, than *A. C.*'s bare affirming that it was ſuch a reſemblance, and yet there can be no other Senſe put upon this Word, than is here put upon it; for *A. C.* ſhew'd it him (the Jeſuit) who look'd on it, endeavouring withal to juſtifie the Practice of their Church in this particular, without offering at any other way of doing it, than by producing that Text in *Daniel Cap. 7. ver. 9.* which I ſhall ſpeak to in its place. But then,

Secondly, This pulling out the *Breviary* hath yet a greater Juſtification attending it, than M. *P.* is willing to make the World believe it hath, and which if prov'd, may go near to relieve this Action from Impertinency. Our Diſputant having objected to D. *T.* (who ſpake of the ſhare the *Greeks* ought to have in our Belief as well as other Churches, in their handing down the Bible to us (as a part at leaſt of the Univerſal Church) that the Teſtimony of the *Greeks* could not be rely'd upon, becauſe of their denial of the Proceſſion of the Third Perſon of the Trinity from the two Firſt. D. *T.* going to anſwer our Diſputant, was interrupted by M. *M.* In this Interval *A. C.* ſeeing the Jeſuit diſengag'd, told him, That as for the *Greeks*, their Diſpute was about Phraſes, and that they were agreed in Senſe; further adding, that upon that ſcore, they were far more juſtifiable in an unwilful miſtake of a Term or Mode of Expreſſion, than the *Roman* Church, who brought down the Glory of the Adorable Trinity, into the pitiful reſemblance of a Picture, thus doing more miſchief by their unwarantable Practiſes, than theſe *Greeks* by their Doctrine: whereupon *A. C.* turn'd to the place, where this delineation was, and ſhow'd it our Jeſuit. And

And now let the World judge where the impertinency of this action lay, and whether it was half so ridiculous as our Disputants making use of his *Speculum*, where his Lesson was prick'd ready to his hand, instead of answering like a Schollar that had undertaken the Cause of his Church. But were these all the impertinent Actions *A. C.* is charged with? No, our Disputant hath not only discover'd Impertinency, but a great deal of rudeness in *A. C's.* procedure: but pray let us hear what 'tis; why he tells the World, "That *A. C.* shew'd "him the Picture with wry Mouths and many An-"tick Gestures. Why truly this is a heavy Charge, and little beseeming a Protestant who had the honour to speak in the defence of his Religion, which, if true would go near to make him resolve never to venture in the Defence of his Religion, if he could not do it with, out so many guilty Actions. But what if this Charge should prove (as I am afraid it will) to be false, and nothing but Calumny, what will become of *M. P's* Reputation, and that mighty Esteem he hath acquired amongst his own Party, of being so well vers'd in all those Qualifications, that are requisite to consummate an able Disputant? I am afraid *M. P.* is grown a little unwary of late, that he is so ready to venture his Reputation without considering what may be the Consequences which will attend the proof of his unfair dealing. But perhaps our Jesuite may not be satisfied, unless it be prov'd that what he charges *A. C.* with, is very far from being true, which I shall endeavour to do, that I may satisfie our Jesuite's longing.

1*st.* Then I answer, *A. C.* is very sure he never kept a stricter guard upon his Actions, than at this Dispute, as not being influenc'd in the least by any Passion, though never more provok'd than at this time, being by our Disputant call'd by a very hard Name, which, had *A. C.*

been

been inclin'd to any Paſſion, in the Diſpute, that unchriſtian uſage of our Jeſuite, might have juſtified the moſt extravagant one: But on the contrary, *A. C* mildly replyed, That as for unkind Words, he was reſolv'd he would not make uſe of any, that he would come behind our Jeſuite in nothing, but in that ſort of Language which he was too well acquainted with, to begin to uſe it now; adding moreover, that he would do our Jeſuite all the kindneſs that lay in his power, having always that notable Saying of a Worthy Gentleman in his mind, "That it was "the method of Charity to ſuffer without re-action. Dares our Diſputant ſay that I gave him the leaſt ill Word? I confeſs part of this Diſcourſe was uſed with our Jeſuite after the Diſpute of the Counſels of *Conſtance* and *Trent*; but however, this is ſufficient to prove the mildneſs *A. C.* uſed towards our Diſputant, in that there was moſt part of this ſpoken after *M. M.* had endeavoured to juſtifie *M. P.* in this ſort of Rudeneſs.

2*ly*. The Æquanimity of *A. C*'s Deportment under theſe Circumſtances, may be partly gueſs'd from the little diſturbance, the weakneſs of our Diſputant's Argument could give an Adverſary; but whether they were ſo or no, the Conference will beſt diſcover. Men are uſually calm and ſedate, when they have an anſwer ready to the Objections of their Antagoniſt. And on the contrary, 'tis then they fly into paſſion, when any thing preſſes them that they cannot anſwer; and that I ſuppoſe made our Jeſuite (inſtead of anſwering *A. C*'s Objections) call him *Buffoon*, unleſs this laſt Word hath ſome extraordinary ſenſe in it, which no Mortal, beſides our Diſputant, hath yet been able to pick out of it; and if it hath, *M. P.* ought to have decyphered it, that the World may be taught for the future, to anſwer by whole-ſale, without uſing that tedious way of twenty Words, when one will do:

: but if no man can find any thing in the Word, but
lency and bitterneſs, as indeed they cannot, how can
Diſputant evade the force of that Reproof the Re-
end D. *T.* gave him, upon his uſing it to *A. C.*? But
t then? Did *M. P.* give *A. C.* no other anſwer?
y truly yes; he told *A. C.* That the Repreſentation
he Trinity was no ſuch ſtrange thing, ſeeing that in
iel, God had appeared in the ſhape of an old Man,
that we might Picture him, ſo we mean not to de-
ate him *ſub ſpecie propriâ*. To this *A. C.* anſwered
ich our Adverſary hath conceal'd) That as for rhe
t before us, what this Prophet ſaw, was only in a
on, which was a Repreſentation of Gods coming to
gment, and fitted only to that particular occaſion;
therefore ought not to be proſtituted to all intents
purpoſes whatſoever: and then for the lawfulneſs
repreſenting God, provided it was not meant to do
b ſpecie propriâ, *A. C.* anſwers now, (he confeſſes he did
anſwer to this laſt part of the Objection at the Con-
nce) Any one may ſee (if he will but take a little pains)
vanity of this diſtinction; for if God's Image be not
n us *ſub ſpecie propriâ*, with relation to his own Eſ-
e, 'tis no more the Image of God, but the Sign of
Power which is repreſented in the above-mentioned
pter of *Daniel*; his Throne was like the fiery flame,

But ſuppoſe all our Diſputant ſays were true, what
fort could it be to a poor Soul, who is charged with
onouring God, who is Infinite, by repreſenting him
in Image that is Finite, and terminated by viſible
enſions, to be told by M. *P.* that he do's not diſhonour
, becauſe he hath no intention to repreſent him *ſub*
: *propriâ*? But becauſe *A. C.* ſaid not this at the Con-
nce, he does intend to add but one Word, or two
e: And firſt, That he might here obſerve, that if it
e granted, that we might picture each of the Three

been inclin'd to any Paſſion, in the Diſpute, that unchriſt
an uſage of our Jeſuite, might have juſtified the moſt e
travagant one: But on the contrary, *A. C* mildly repl
ed, That as for unkind Words, he was reſolv'd he wou
not make uſe of any, that he would come behind our J
ſuite in nothing, but in that ſort of Language which
was too well acquainted with, to begin to uſe it nov
adding moreover, that he would do our Jeſuite all t
kindneſs that lay in his power, having always that notab
Saying of a Worthy Gentleman in his mind, "That it w
"the method of Charity to ſuffer without re-actic
Dares our Diſputant ſay that I gave him the leaſt
Word? I confeſs part of this Diſcourſe was uſed wi
our Jeſuite after the Diſpute of the Counſels of *Co*
ſtance and *Trent*; but however, this is ſufficient to pro
the mildneſs *A. C.* uſed towards our Diſputant, in th
there was moſt part of this ſpoken after *M. M.* had e
deavoured to juſtifie *M. P.* in this ſort of Rud
neſs.

2ly. The Æquanimity of *A. C*'s Deportment under th
Circumſtances, may be partly gueſs'd from the little
ſturbance, the weakneſs of our Diſputant's Argum
could give an Adverſary; but whether they were ſo
no, the Conference will beſt diſcover. Men are uſually c
and ſedate, when they have an anſwer ready to
Objections of their Antagoniſt. And on the contr
'tis then they fly into paſſion, when any thing pre
them that they cannot anſwer; and that I ſuppoſe m
our Jeſuite (inſtead of anſwering *A. C*'s Objections)
him *Buffoon*, unleſs this laſt Word hath ſome extrao
nary ſenſe in it, which no Mortal, beſides our Diſput
hath yet been able to pick out of it; and if it hath,
P. ought to have decyphered it, that the World may
taught for the future, to anſwer by whole-ſale, with
uſing that tedious way of twenty Words, when one

do: but if no man can find any thing in the Word, but virulency and bitterneſs, as indeed they cannot, how can our Diſputant evade the force of that Reproof the Reverend D. *T.* gave him, upon his uſing it to *A. C.*? But what then? Did *M. P.* give *A. C.* no other anſwer? Why truly yes; he told *A. C.* That the Repreſentation of the Trinity was no ſuch ſtrange thing, ſeeing that in *Daniel*, God had appeared in the ſhape of an old Man, and that we might Picture him, ſo we mean not to delineate him *ſub ſpecie propriâ*. To this *A. C.* anſwered (which our Adverſary hath conceal'd) That as for the Text before us, what this Prophet ſaw, was only in a Viſion, which was a Repreſentation of Gods coming to Judgment, and fitted only to that particular occaſion; and therefore ought not to be proſtituted to all intents and purpoſes whatſoever: and then for the lawfulneſs of repreſenting God, provided it was not meant to do it *ſub ſpecie propriâ*, *A. C.* anſwers now, (he confeſſes he did not anſwer to this laſt part of the Objection at the Conference) Any one may ſee (if he will but take a little pains) the vanity of this diſtinction; for if God's Image be not given us *ſub ſpecie propriâ*, with relation to his own Eſſence, 'tis no more the Image of God, but the Sign of his Power which is repreſented in the above-mentioned Chapter of *Daniel*; his Throne was like the fiery flame, *&c.* But ſuppoſe all our Diſputant ſays were true, what comfort could it be to a poor Soul, who is charged with diſhonouring God, who is Infinite, by repreſenting him by an Image that is Finite, and terminated by viſible Dimenſions, to be told by M. *P.* that he do's not diſhonour God, becauſe he hath no intention to repreſent him *ſub ſpecie propriâ*? But becauſe *A. C.* ſaid not this at the Conference, he does intend to add but one Word, or two more: And firſt, That he might here obſerve, that if it were granted, that we might picture each of the Three

Perſons of the B. Trinity apart; that this could be no argument at all, for it's reſembling it (the Trinity), becauſe ſuch Reſemblances does not only make Three Perſons, but Three Gods; ſuch Images as theſe, repreſent not only a diſtinction of Perſons, but a diverſity of Subſtance. I leave our Jeſuite to think of this; for it is not *A. C*'s. meaning to enlarge on this Subject, as intending only to give a Relation of what he ſaid at the Conference. Our Diſputant goes on, telling us, That the School-Maſter (meaning *A. C.*) ſtill interpoſing with *impertinent Queſtions*, *M. P.* bad him be ſilent; but I would fain know of our Jeſuite, which of thoſe Queſtions were *Impertinent*. If he means by this Word, that the *Queſtions A. C.* asked, were not at all to our Jeſuits purpoſe, which was to make the *Spectators* believe, he was very knowing in thoſe things he talked of with ſo much freedom, and of which, all unbyaſs'd perſons at the Aſſembly found he was very ignorant: *A. C.* is very ready to confeſs that he was impertinent enough; but becauſe (it may be) our Diſputant may take impertinency in it's moſt ordinary ſence, *A. C.* need not clear himſelf here, becauſe it is already done to his hand in the Body of the Conference, whither I refer the Reader for ſatisfaction in this point. D. *T.* finding *M. P.* to be very ignorant of common Church-Hiſtory, which he perceived by the Anſwers our Jeſuite made him, D. *T.* preſſed *M. P.* about the Councel of *Lateran*: This Diſputant having firſt nam'd this Councel himſelf (where the term Tranſubſtantiation was invented, to expreſs the Corporeal Preſence, after the year 1200, after it had been broached by *Paſchaſius Radbertus*, in the year 818.) but while this was asking, *M. M.* pulled D. *T.* to be ſatisfiedabout ſome Queſtions he had to propoſe. *A. C.* (ſeeing D. *T.* engaged with *M. M.*) took up the Jeſuit, and made an end of what D. *T.* had began by asking our Jeſuit

ſuit, ſome important Queſtions, which concerned the *Lateran* Council, which no Perſons (that had but the leaſt knowledge of this Council by any other way, than that of Quotation) could be ignorant of: As, How many Fathers there were, who preſided in it, *&c.* To the firſt he anſwers, a Thouſand, and to the laſt, nothing. In all our Jeſuit's Accuſations of *A. C.* we have not one word of what was anſwered, neither of what *A. C.* replyed occaſionally when ſtanding by D. *T.* nor what was urged in the laſt Room betwixt our Diſputant and *A. C.* about the contradictions of the Two Councils, *Conſtance* and *Trent*, upon the queſtion of the Pope's Superiority. All this our Jeſuit hath quite ſlipt over, either wilfully or forgetfully, I ſhall not determine which: If the firſt, our Diſputant hath unworthily prevaricated in the cauſe of God, and render'd the Proteſtants cauſe weak and impotent, which I am ſure is not the part of a Gentleman, nor a Scholar: if the laſt, it had been the part of a prudent perſon to have taken ſurer meaſures, to have acted more cautiouſly in a thing of this Conſequence, before he had ventured to have treated *A. C.* with ſo much virulency and contempt: but to prevent all miſrepreſentation, I ſhall annex the Diſcourſe *A. C.* had both with *M. M.* and our Diſputant, at the end of this Paper, which, according to the exacteſt care I could take, of neither adding any thing on *A.C*'s ſide, or omitting on his Adverſaries, was thus: When the Queſtion of [How the Proteſtants could tell that the Bible they uſed, was really what they, (the Proteſtants) thought it to be, the Word of God,] had been canvaſs'd ſome while, *M. M.* ariſing, went to the other end of the Room, whither *A. C.* follow'd him, deſiring ſome ſatisfaction about the prohibition in the Second Commandment; *A. C.* telling him, that this way of worſhipping of God, and the Saints (beſides the utter unlawfulneſs of worſhipping the latter, either ultimately

An Account of the Conference betwixt M. *M.* and *A. C.* about the Confeſſional.

or relatively) by Repreſentations, they brought down the Glory of Holineſs, which conſiſted in the Excellency of inward Diſpoſitions, to the contemptible lowneſs of being beholden, for the moſt indiſtracted part of our Devotion to the ſight of an Image; which is a readier way to advance, than to cure our Diſtraction; that it was much more agreeable to the Precepts of the Goſpel, to ſerve God after his own Preſcription, who being a Spirit, our Saviour tells us, *muſt be worſhipped in Spirit and in Truth.* M. *M.* anſwer'd, That we were Finite Creatures, and what conceptions we had of God, could be no more than finite neither; and therefore why not by an Image? The firſt part of this I granted, but muſt not, I told him, allow of his Inference, telling him, we ought to come as near to the Nature of God as poſſible, in our Devotions to him; but that would beſt be done, by a Worſhip, abſtracted from all material repreſentations of him. To this M. *M.* anſwered, Well, well; and from thence began to preach me a Moral Lecture, which I heartily thank'd him for; and ſo we parted for that time, he to the Converſation of ſome Women of his Acquaintance, and *A. C.* to the place of Diſpute; whither he went ſome time after to *M. M.* again, who was then at the Window; but there happening a little time after, a Diſcourſe about the Confeſſional, (*A. C.* does not exactly remember for what Reaſons the Queſtion was ſtarted) *A. C.* asked *M. M.* What if a Perſon that was a Traytor to the Kingdom or State, of which he was a Subject, and was actually in Conſpiracy with others againſt that Kingdom or State; if this Traytor ſhould come, and reveal this Conſpiracy to a Prieſt, by way of Confeſſion, muſt that Prieſt reveal the horrid Secret or not? To which *M. M.* reply'd, No; that Prieſt muſt not diſcloſe it. What! replyed *A. C.* and muſt ſuch a Kingdom or State, be involv'd in Blood and ruine, for want

want of ſuch an Obedience as Indiſpenſibly obliges every Subject of what Capacity ſoever, not to be wanting in his utmoſt endeavours for the preſervation of that Kingdom or State he owes all the Happineſſes of Life to? To this M. *M.* reply'd, That all this was nothing, all that the Prieſt could do in this matter, was to deny him Abſolution, if he did not Repent. And is this (repeated *A. C.*) all the ſecurity a King or Kingdom muſt expect from you in ſuch a juncture of Affairs? Is not the Prieſt (by taking Methods like theſe) actually enrolled in the Number of the Conſpiratours? are not they as ſure of him in relation to ſecreſie, as of the greateſt Deſperado in all their Cabal? Is it very likely, that Fellows deſperately reſolv'd to do ſuch barbarous Acts of Wickedneſs, will be much mov'd or concern'd at your denial of Abſolution to them? To this *M. M.* reply'd, That *A. C.* was out in his Conceptions, for the Prieſt did not help the Conſpirators by theſe means. And ſeeing him ſtop there, *A. C.* anſwer'd, And is it poſſible that ſuch an Ingenious Man as M. *M.* can be guilty of ſo great an abſurdity, as to ſay (as you do) that the Prieſt does not help the Conſpirators, becauſe he does not actually make ſome endeavours himſelf towards the promotion of ſuch a deed of darkneſs? To all which *A. C.* could have nothing returned, but, That if the Prieſt did deny him Abſolution, he had done his Duty. After which *A. C.* had no further Diſcourſe with M. *M.* nor any other, till a part of the Company retired into another Room, whither *A. C.* follow'd them, and engag'd himſelf with the Jeſuit, about the Decrees of ſome later Councils, as thoſe of *Conſtance* and *Trent*, againſt which he endeavour'd to prove a Contradiction in their Decrees; the firſt of theſe ſetting up the Council above the Pope; the latter deciding the direct contrary, ſetting up the

An Account of the Conference betwixt our Jeſuit and *A. C.*

Pope

Pope above the Council. *A. C.* affirm'd, That this firſt Council could not be Infallible, becauſe it had not been Conven'd by a Lawful Pope, but had aſſembled it ſelf at the Sollicitation of Chriſtian Princes, and by the ſole Authority and Power of the College of Cardinals: Now if a Council cannot be Infallible without the Pope in Perſon or by his Legates, then it is plain this Council was not Infallible, becauſe there was no true Pope in being; for it conven'd to condem three falſe ones; now were the Acts during the Interval of this Council Infallible or not? To which M. *P.* anſwer'd in the affirmative. To which *A. C.* reply'd, What, without a Pope? To this our Diſputant ſaid, That this ſignified little, ſo long as the Pope confirm'd what the Council had done; and when *A. C.* reply'd, That the queſtion was not about the Infallibility of the Decrees after Confirmation; but whither the Deciſions of the Council before Confirmation were Obligatory upon Mens Conſciences, ſo as to oblige all Perſons of what Capacity ſoever, to act in purſuance of them; and if they were, then ſuch ſubmiſſion muſt be due to them, by vertue of ſome Infallible Authority enjoyning ſuch ſubmiſſion; but the Authority that enjoyn'd the Execution of the Canons of this Council, was not Infallible, becauſe it wanted an Eſſential part of its Infallibility, *viz.* the Preſence of the Pope in Perſon, or by his Legats; thus theſe Qualifications being wanting, the Authority that exacted Obedience to their Decrees, was fallible; and upon that ſcore, could not indiſpenſibly oblige any Individual Member of their Church to ſubmit to it with an implicit Obedience. M. *P.* ſtill urged the Confirmation (which the Pope gave the Acts of this Council) for their being infallible, and therefore Univerſally Obligatory. *A. C.* ſeeing our Diſputant could not be made to drop this Inſignificant ſhift, asked him what

what that was the Pope confirmed? an Error? For amongſt the Acts of this Council, the Supremacy of a Council above a Pope was actually decreed; but the Council of *Trent* which came afterward, decreed juſt the contrary: Now one of theſe Councils was certainly miſtaken, for their Canons (which reſpect this Article) are form'd in direct contrariety to each other; this Council coming under debate, *A. C.* ask'd, our Jeſuit, What he thought of the Decree made at *Trent* about the Forfeiture that Princes were to ſuffer, in Caſe they ſhould permit any Duellings in their Territories? The Import of the Decree in *Engliſh* runs in this Senſe, in ſhort, *viz.* That if the places on which the Duels were fought, be Fief Lands, they ſhall Eſcheat to the Lords of the Fiefe; I do not exactly remember whether our Diſputant objected that Clauſe *quod ab Eccleſia obtinent*, which implies that the Forfeiture ſhould only be of thoſe Lands that were holden of the Church; and if our Jeſuit did object this, (becauſe I would not omit any thing material he ſaid in his defence) *A. C.* anſwers in the Words of a late Ingenious Gentleman, who ſays, That that Clauſe, *quod ab Eccleſia obtinent*, was inſerted into the Decree, only to hinder the oppoſition that would have been made by the Ambaſſadors of Kings and Princes, who were preſent in that Council, and who would never have let paſs a Decree ſo deſtructive of their Maſter's Intereſts; from all which *A. C.* Inferred, He that can by Virtue of ſome Right reſiding in himſelf, diſpoſe (upon any pretence whatſoever) of a parcel of Land as big as this Room (ſpeaking of the Room he was in) may take away a Province, and he that may *Jure ſuo* take away a Province; may riſle a Prince of his Dominions; but that is depoſing of them: To which M. *P.* reply'd, No ſuch thing, for if my Prince ſhall lay upon me a

moderate

moderate Tax, hath therefore that Prince a Right to all I have? To which *A. C.* anſwer'd, No, adding, That what M. *P.* urg'd as a Simile, was not at all like the thing we diſputed of; for the Queſtion was not of the Power of Princes over their Subjects, but the Juriſdiction of the Eccleſiaſtical State, over that of the Civil one, without this latter States leave; to which M. *P.* reply'd, All good Princes ought to conſent to the Deciſions of the Church; But anſwer'd, *A. C.* ſuppoſe thoſe good Princes are not in a very good Humour (as 'tis ten to one if they are, when the Church decides ſo favourably for her ſelf) and have no mind to recede from their Right to any part or parts of their Dominions, of which they are the true owners; muſt they be diſpoſſeſs'd of their Rights againſt their Wills? To all which *A. C.* had no other anſwer than this, or much to the ſame Effect, *viz.* That in ſuch a Caſe the Church had power to decide in favour of it ſelf. Well, ſays *A. C.* to our Jeſuit, if the Caſe be ſo, I am ſatisfied; and withal turned himſelf away, and had ſome Diſcourſe with a Gentleman by the Bed ſide.

FINIS.